



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,425	08/20/2003	Pierre-Yves Sibille	2002PI3423 US01	6974
7590 05/04/2007				
Elsa Keller Siemens Corporation Intellectual Property Department 170 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830				
			EXAMINER MOUTAOUAKIL, MOUNIR	
			ART UNIT 2616	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/04/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/644,425

Applicant(s)

SIBILLE ET AL.

Examiner

Mounir Moutaouakil

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08/20/2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) The invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Constantinof et al (US 6,822,961). Hereinafter referred to as Constantinof.

Regarding claims 1 and 12. Constantinof discloses a method for signaling a bearer connection coupled to a telecommunications network (see figure 2 and 1 and see column 4, lines 48-67. A bearer network connected to an ATM network), wherein the telecommunications network employs a first protocol and the bearer connection employs a second protocol, the method comprises the steps of mapping at least a portion of the first protocol to the second protocol; and inserting a first signal of the first protocol into a second signal of the second protocol according to the mapping (see figure 1, see column 5, lines 5-19. IP protocols are converted to ATM cells and vice versa; which inherently include mapping and inserting data from one signal to another), wherein the first signal of the first protocol is employed in the control of the bearer connection (see figure 1 and column 5 lines 5-19. inherently, the bearer connection is controlled by the first signal from the first protocol in view of the fact that the command

or the control parameters are mapped or inserted into the second signal of the second protocol).

Regarding claims 2-7, 9 and 13-17. Constantinof discloses a method where the first protocol is an Internet Protocol (IP) and the second protocol is an asynchronous transfer mode (ATM) protocol, wherein the step of mapping maps at least a portion of the Internet Protocol to the ATM protocol (see column 5, lines 5-19. the system converts IP packets to ATM cells and vice versa. Inherently, when converting IP packet to ATM cells, multiple data will get transferred from the IP packet to the ATM cells such as control parameters, IP port information, header information, payload...).

Regarding claim 8, Constantinof discloses a method where the step of mapping redefines a portion of the network prefix field (within the ATM address) following an authority and format identifier (see column 5, lines 5-19. IP packets are converted to ATM cells. Inherently, it is a designer's choice to modify and redefine the prefix field of the ATM address as long as it does not violate standard ITU or ATM Forum addressing rules).

Regarding claim 10 and 11, Constantinof disclose the second protocol as a generic identifier transport (GIT) information element, where the step of translating translates the first signal into a signal suitable for insertion into the GIT information element, and mapping the first signal translated into a user data area of the GIT information element. (Inherently, the standard ATM cell structure indicates that GIT IE as part of the ATM cell. Moreover, user data area is part of the GIT IE. the person of ordinary skill in the art would know how to employ the GTI information element to carry

translated elements from the first signal associated with the first protocol and to map the first signal into a user data area of the GIT IE.

Regarding claim 18, the apparatus of Constantinof further discloses a switch (see figure 10, element 40 is a TDM switch).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Constantinof in view of Sen (US 2003/0112761).

Regarding claims 19 and 20. Constantinof disclosed all the limitations of claim 12.

The apparatus of Constantinof does not comprise an ingress and egress media gateways to initiate and terminate calls. However, Sen discloses a method of employing ingress media gateway (IMG) to initiate calls and egress media gateways (EMG) to terminate calls. Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ IMG and EMG to the telecommunication system of Constantinof. IMG and EMG are connected to the Ingress end user and egress end user respectively through TDM (see figure 1, and paragraph 23). The motivation for using the IMG and EMG of Sen into the telecommunication system of Constantinof being that it will terminate and initiate communication, depending on the

control data received. Moreover, media gateway since they are can convert data from the format required for one type of network to the format required for another.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO_892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mounir Moutaouakil whose telephone number is 571-270-1416. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (4pm-4: 30pm) eastern time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on 571-272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Application/Control Number: 10/644,425

Page 6

Art Unit: 2616

Mounir Moutaouakil

Art Unit: 2616



HASSAN KIZOU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600